

wellbore employing a cement slurry that includes a hydraulic cement and an aluminum silicate that comprises at least one of kaolin, metakaolin, halloysite, dickite, nacrite, or a mixture thereof. Therefore, for at least this reason, claims 7, 10, 16 and 19 are nonobvious over the combination of Messenger and Griffith.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that § 103 rejection of claims 7, 10, 16 and 19 be withdrawn: Favorable reconsideration is requested.

G. Conclusion

The Examiner has already indicated that claims 20-24 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections. This being done, Applicants submit that these claims are now allowable. The Examiner indicated that each of claims 8, 9, 17, 18, 31 and 32 were rejected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. As each of the amended independent claims from which claims 8, 9, 17, 18, 31 and 32 depend have been shown allowable above, these dependent claims are also now allowable. Reconsideration of the application and claims is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (512) 347-1611 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,



William W. Enders

Reg. No. 41,735

Attorney for Applicant

Date: 10/1/99

O'Keefe, Egan & Peterman LLP

1101 S. Capital of Texas Highway
Building C, Suite 200
Austin, TX 78746
512/347-1611
FAX 512/347-1615